

**AB 599 Public Advisory Committee**

Sheraton Grand Hotel  
1230 J Street  
Sacramento, California

*Meeting Summary*

Wednesday, May 29<sup>th</sup>, 2002

**Convene Meeting**

The meeting began at 9:35 a.m. Members of the PAC, staff, and the public introduced themselves.

**Review Agenda and Approve February 27 Meeting Summary**

Steve Ekstrom, PAC facilitator, described the plan for the day. He also noted that the workshop format is one that was requested by the PAC at its last meeting. Each workshop represents a specific chapter of the final report and will be initiated by an ITF member followed by discussion and consideration of ITF recommendations.

The meeting summary for April 9, 2002 was approved as mailed with the following correction: on page 2, sixth bullet regarding the cost of GeoTracker, the number cited is the approximate cost of GeoTracker, not the adaptation of GeoTracker to meet the monitoring needs of AB599.

**Workshop: Goals of the Comprehensive Groundwater Monitoring Program  
(Chapter 2 of Report)**

Lisa Babcock reviewed the five proposed goals.

John Troiano and Neil Dubrovsky respectively presented Goal 1 (multi-functionality and scalability) and Goal 2 (capable of making various assessments). Several comments were made by PAC members:

- Are detection limits or reporting limits being considered as criteria for being in the database?
- There should be a pathway evaluation between source and destination of pollutants.
- The database should have a regional bibliography of reports, studies, etc.
- The hydrology of each system needs to be well understood.
- Include all data and meta-data

**Consensus point:** The program should be able to assess where groundwater contamination is affected by surface water.

**Consensus:** Goals 1 and 2 were adopted by the PAC

Al Vargas, Lisa Babcock and Doug Osugi, respectively, presented:

- Goal 3 (data accessibility)
- Goal 4 (interagency coordination)
- Goal 5 (resource needs)

Several comments were made by PAC members:

- What does “findings” in Goal 3 mean?  
This initiated a substantial discussion about whether the program ultimately collects and stores data, or whether it also will produce ongoing reports. It was agreed that the “product” of the program needs further discussion at the next PAC meeting.
- The original language of Goal 4 and 5 needed to be strengthened.

**Consensus:** The following new language for Goal 3 was adopted: “The program should be accessible and user-friendly.”

**Consensus:** The following new language for Goal 4 was adopted: “The program should include an on-going process to ensure effective interagency coordination and collaboration on new and existing groundwater issues.”

**Consensus:** The following new language for Goal 5 was adopted: “The program should include mechanisms for justifying on-going resource needs.”

## Public Comment

Members of the public were asked if they had any comments. These included:

- Regarding program products, think about who the PAC views as the audience, i.e., who’s involved?
- Data “uploaders” should be able to perform analytical work using the database.
- Goals 1 and 2 need better descriptions; information on Goal 4 (interagency coordination/collaboration) should be available to the public; regarding products, consider an annual report of what’s been accomplished and what the data needs are.

## Workshop: Data Management Needs for the Comprehensive Groundwater Monitoring Program (Chapter 5 of Report)

Following John Troiano’s presentation of the ITF’s recommendations (which included an analysis of GeoTracker, EnviroMapper and ScoreCard), users from Chevron/Texaco and Sacramento County Environmental Management Department discussed their experience with GeoTracker software. In the discussion, several comments were made:

- All participating agencies/departments will need to use a common database vocabulary in order to more efficiently share information.
- What types of tools are available on GeoTracker, and what tools might be needed? **Decision:** GeoTracker tools will be discussed at the next PAC meeting.

- Can DHS data be transported to GeoTracker? (Answer: Yes, data are already copied to GeoTracker, even though DHS doesn't use GeoTracker).
- Will agencies/departments keep their own databases? (Answer: Yes, most likely).
- **The key issue** is that the different databases will be able to communicate with each other and data accessible on GeoTracker.

**Consensus:** The PAC adopted the ITF recommendation to use GeoTracker as the monitoring program's database application.

## **Workshop: Interagency Coordination for Groundwater Monitoring Programs (Chapter 4 of Report) and Existing Groundwater Monitoring Programs (Chapter 3 of Report)**

Following Lisa Babcock's brief discussion, PAC comments regarding Chapter 3 – Existing Programs - included:

- It might be a good idea to identify data gaps early in the final report.
- Should other databases, e.g., meteorological, be considered?

**Consensus:** The PAC adopted the ITF's recommendations for Chapter 3 contents.

Following James Giannopoulos' brief discussion, PAC comments regarding Chapter 4 – Interagency Coordination - included:

- Maybe we should have an "ITF" type of mechanism that address key issues across agencies on a regular basis.
- We should examine any possible structural changes in how agencies work together as that is expected in the legislation. On the other hand, are structural changes needed as long as there's a common tool (GeoTracker) that links all involved?  
**Decision:** this item will be discussed at a subsequent PAC meeting (probably August 28). To promote discussion, the ITF should detail out the PYs in each agency (e.g., what are they working on and where?), and find other facts that can illuminate a discussion of structural issues.
- Can labs test for broader suites of constituents in order to maximize the testing of a single sample?
- Look at data dictionaries of the various agencies/departments as a way of discovering any duplication of effort.

**Consensus:** The PAC adopted ITF's recommendations with the following language change to the last bullet: "Create a mechanism to insure interagency coordination, including an evaluation of structural changes."

## **Establish Next PAC Meeting Agenda; Approve Workplan**

The agenda for the July 24 meeting will include:

- Review drafts of Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5

- Conduct workshops on Chapters 6 and 7
- Continue discussion of “assessments/tools/products” generated by the comprehensive groundwater monitoring program
- Discuss GeoTracker tools

**Consensus:** The ITF’s proposed workplan was adopted by the PAC.

## **Public Comment**

Members of the public were asked if they had any comments. None chose to address the PAC at this time.

## **Evaluate Meeting and Adjourn**

PAC members expressed satisfaction for the workshop format of this meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.